

## **REMARKS**

The action rejected the claims over Microsoft Outlook 2003. Outlook's limited features, however, are precisely the prior art that the claimed invention sought to overcome. Take an example from Outlook: If a user wants to reply to an email message and delete the message, he must first select the reply button, and then when he is done composing his reply, select the delete button to delete the message from his inbox. This requires 2 selections. And that is just that one example; other tasks in Outlook require multiple button or menu selections; the claimed invention consolidates those button/menu selections into single selections.

For example, in claim 1, "when said user receives a mail item in said user's inbox operation of one said button enables said user to reply to the mail item, forward the mail item, or create a new item entry and said mail item is respectively copied to said reply, forwarded mail item or new item entry, and further wherein said mail item is removed from said inbox."<sup>1</sup> Claim 1's recitation is a one-step solution to a multi-step problem in Outlook. Many of the dependent claims recite further steps that can be folded into a single claimed step and thus Outlook fails to anticipate or render obvious claims 1-8.

New claim 9 attempts to make the difference from Outlook even more clear in reciting that "such that when said user receives a mail item in said user's inbox operation of a single one of the buttons enables said user to:

---

<sup>1</sup> The amendment to claim 1 merely clarifies usage and is not substantive.

(1) reply to the mail item, forward the mail item, or create a new item entry;  
(2) copy the mail item to the reply, forwarded mail item, or new item entry, and  
(3) remove the mail item from the inbox." The Outlook prior art cited in the action fails to disclose where a single button does all of the above mentioned tasks and thus, similar to claim 1, Outlook fails to teach or suggest the claims limitations.

The pending claims should all now be allowable. If the examiner believes that an interview would advance the prosecution of this case, he is invited to call the undersigned at his convenience.

Respectfully submitted,

Stephen Daryl Barnes

By /Stephen B. Schott/  
Stephen B. Schott  
Registration No. 51,294  
(215) 568-6400

Volpe and Koenig, P.C.  
United Plaza, Suite 1600  
30 South 17th Street  
Philadelphia, PA 19103

SBS/jal